This was against the original Central outlay of Rs. 3.59 crores for 2875 groups. However, the enhanced allocation was made in view of the State's excellent performance under the programme and its request for additional assistance. The State Government has confirmed that it will be releasing its matching share soon.

Gas-based power projects in Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat

2401. SHRIMATI VEENA VERMA:
SHRI SUSHILKUKAR SAMBHAJIRAO SHINDE:
SHRI RAJUBHAI A. PARMAR:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat Governments had submitted a number of proposals for gas-based power projects; if so, the details thereof;

(b) at what stage of approval or examination the same stand, indicating the gas availability required therefor; and

(c) the reasons for delay in clearing the same?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER (DR. S. VENUGOPALACHARI): (a) The details of gas based power projects received from the States of Madhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat for technoeconomic clearance are given below:

Name of the State, Project and Capacity	Estimated cost (Rs. in crores)
1. Madhya Pradesh—NIL	
2. Maharashtra (MSEB) Uran Combined Cycle Gas Turbine (CCGT) Extension Project—400 MW (2×130 MW GTS+1×140 MW ST)	765.70
3. Gujarat (Gujarat Power Corporation Ltd.) Pipavav Power Station—615 MW CCGT (Revised FR)	1915

(b) and (c). Uran CCGT proposal envisages replacement of the 2×60 MW existing gas turbines units by 2×130 MW+1×140 MW steam turbines units. This proposal can be taken up for techno-economic clearance by CEA after the scrapping of the existing units has been approved by CEA. Gas requirements for the replacement units would be met from the existing commitments. The gas linkage for Pipavav CCGT project will be feasible only the gas availability profile getting revised on the basis of further exploration of gas in the country.

Construction of building for HAM under MPLADS

2402. SHRI JAGIR SINGH DARD:
DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR:

Will the minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that when an MP suggests construction of a building under MPLADS to a Local Body for the purpose of a HAM (Amateur Radio Club) and the scheme is sanctioned and the construction is started, can the MP give the Project No.3 (HAM Amateur Radio Club) to the Ameteur Radio Club, duly registered and licenced by the Wireless Planning Wing of the Department of Communications, for which the building is being constructed under MPLADS;

(b) whether such centralised facility developed by the Local Body would help propagate electronics consciousness among the youngsters; and

(c) if so, what steps would have to be taken to go about this scheme?